

REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated February 3, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-21, 24-26, 28-29, 32-42, 45-47, 49-59, 62-64, 66-72, 75-77, and 79-84, and objected to claims 3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, 48, 60-61, 65, 73-74, and 78. By this amendment, claims 1, 18-20, 32-33, 35-40, and 58 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-84 remain pending.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on July 15, 2009. Independent claim 1 was discussed in light of Halahmi (U.S. 2003/0011631). In particular, the teachings of the Halahmi reference were contrasted with the limitations recited in a proposed amendment of claim 1.

The amendments herein reflect the amendments discussed during the interview.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 17-18, 20, 32, 34, 39-40, and 57 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Halahmi (U.S. 2003/0011631).

A. Claims 1 and 17.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite “displaying the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode **without using definition information**” and “switching onscreen representation . . . from onscreen representation in a text browsing **mode in which the definition information is not applied**, to onscreen representation in which the definition is applied.” (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by at least page 21, lines 14-20 of the specification.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 1, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0052]-[0055] and [0061]-[0062] of Halahmi and stated: “[i]nformation to be applied to the entire page, such as a template for laying out the page and navigation information are used in the rendering of each

portion.” The Examiner also cited to paragraph [0063] and stated: “upon completion of constructing subsequent portions of the page the view is then switched to allow a user to access the processed portions.” (Office Action, pp. 26-27.) Based on the Examiner’s statements, Applicants believe the Examiner alleges that by disclosing the display of constructed portions of a page, Halahmi discloses switching onscreen representation from a text browsing mode to another mode in which definition information is applied. Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi, but in any event, Applicants have amended claim 1 to explicitly recite the display of a text-browsing mode “**without using definition information.**” Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 has overcome the Examiner’s rejection.

In particular, paragraphs [0052]-[0055] of Halahmi, cited to by the Examiner, relate to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. Paragraph [0052] discloses the construction of a portion from parsed data using a predetermined template. Paragraphs [0053]-[0055] provide examples of how a portion may be constructed. For example, line breaks and text wrapping may be added. (Paragraphs [0053]-[0054].) Font type and height may also be determined during portion construction. (Paragraph [0055].) “[N]avigational option” such as “navigational icons or links” may also be added to a portion. (Paragraph [0061].) Paragraph [0062] discloses that once a portion has been constructed, it may be sent individually, or together with other portions, to a wireless device. Paragraph [0063] further discloses that a device may receive portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed. Based on the foregoing, one skilled in the art would recognize that the **portions are constructed for onscreen representation, using definition information**, such as line breaks, font type and height.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites “displaying the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode **without using definition information**,” and “switching onscreen representation . . . from onscreen representation in a text browsing **mode in which the definition information is not applied**, to onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied.” (Emphasis added.) The specification makes clear that the recited “text browsing mode” is a browsing mode “in which a browser forms onscreen representation **in accordance with text information** in a page without applying external style sheets and external scripts,” which are

definition information to be applied, to the entire page. (Specification, pg. 21, ll. 14-20, emphasis added.)

By disclosing the display of constructed portions that include definition information, however, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen representation from one mode to another, or that one mode of onscreen representation is a text browsing mode without using definition information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

B. Claims 18, 20, and 32.

In maintaining his rejection of claims 18, 20 and 32, the Examiner stated: “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 17. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 27.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claims 1 and 17 also apply to his rejection of claims 18, 20 and 32. (See Office Action, pp. 26-27.)

Applicants note that amended independent claims 18, 20 and 32 include limitations that are not recited in claim 1, and vice versa. Similar to claim 1, however, amended claims 18, 20 and 32 recite “displaying the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode without using definition information” and “switching onscreen representation . . . from onscreen representation in the text browsing mode in which the definition information is not applied, to onscreen representation in which definition information is applied.”

As stated above, Halahmi discloses the display of constructed portions that include definition information. As such, and in contrast to claims 18, 20 and 32, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen representation from one mode to another, or that one mode of onscreen representation is a text browsing mode without using definition information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claims 18, 20 and 32. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 18, 20 and 32 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

C. Claim 34.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 34, the Examiner stated: “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 17. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 27.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claims 1 and 17 also apply to his rejection of claim 34. (See Office Action, pp. 26-27.)

Applicants note that claim 34 includes limitations that are not recited in claims 1 and 17, and vice versa. Similar to claims 1 and 17, however, claim 34 does recite a displaying operation on data of the page “without using definition information.”

As stated above, Halahmi discloses the display of constructed portions that include definition information. As such, and in contrast to claim 34, Halahmi does not disclose a displaying operation on data of the page “without using definition information.”

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 34 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

D. Claim 39.

Amended independent claim 39 recites “displaying the page in a **first** browsing mode which makes **less rich presentation** on a screen than a **second** browsing mode in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied,” and “switching onscreen representation in the first browsing mode . . . to the second browsing mode.” (Emphasis added.)

In maintaining his rejection of claim 39, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0052]-[0055] and [0063]-[0064] of Halahmi as disclosing the above recited limitations of claim 39. The Examiner stated: (1) paragraphs [0052]-[0055] disclose “a template [that] is analogous to a style sheet”; (2) paragraph [0064] discloses “scripts external to the web page”; and (3) paragraph [0063] discloses “the initial display of the first portion of the webpage is less rich than a presentation of the portion in the second browsing mode based upon the first being the only portion active until a second portion has been processed.” (Office Action, pg. 27.) Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

1. Paragraphs [0052]-[0055] do not disclose a mode with less rich presentation.

As stated above, paragraphs [0052]-[0055] of Halahmi, cited to by the Examiner, relate to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. Paragraph [0052] discloses the construction of a portion from parsed data using a predetermined template. Paragraphs [0053]-[0055] provide examples of how a portion may be constructed. For example, line breaks and text wrapping may be added. (Paragraphs [0053]-[0054].) Font type and height may also be determined during portion construction. (Paragraph [0055].) Paragraph [0062] discloses that once a portion has been constructed, it may be sent individually, or together with other portions, to a wireless device. Paragraph [0063] further discloses that a device may receive portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed. Based on the foregoing, one skilled in the art would recognize that **constructed portions** are received by the device for onscreen representation.

Halahmi’s disclosure of displaying constructed portions in paragraphs [0052]-[0055], however, does not disclose switching onscreen representation from **one mode to another**, or that one mode of onscreen representation is **less rich** than another.

2. Paragraph [0064] does not disclose external scripts.

The Examiner also cited to paragraph [0064] as disclosing “scripts external to the web page.” (Office Action, pg. 27.) In particular, paragraph [0064] discloses the use of scripting languages to **perform background receiving** of portion data by a display device. In contrast to

Halahmi, the specification makes clear that the “external script,” recited by claim 39, contains information to be applied to the entire web page. (Pg 3, ll. 6-12.)

Halahmi’s disclosure of the use of scripting languages to **receive** constructed portions, however, does not disclose a “second browsing mode in which an external style sheet and an **external script** in the page are **applied**,” as recited by claim 39.

3. Paragraph [0063] does not disclose a mode with less rich presentation.

The Examiner also cited to paragraph [0063] and stated: “the initial display of the first portion of the webpage is less rich than a presentation of the portion in the second browsing mode based upon the first being the only portion active until a second portion has been processed.” (Office Action, pg. 27.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner alleges that the incremental display of portions of a page, as portions are received, discloses the above recited limitation of claim 39, because a page having fewer portions being displayed is less rich than the same page having more portions being displayed. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading.

As stated above, Halahmi discloses that constructed portions are received by a device for onscreen representation. Paragraph [0063] further discloses that a device may receive constructed portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed. In contrast, the specification of the present invention makes clear that one browsing mode is less rich than another because of the application of, for example, an external style sheet and an external script. (Pg. 32, ll. 16-19.)

As such, by disclosing receiving constructed portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen representation from one mode that is **less rich** than another mode in which an external style sheet and an **external script** in the page are **applied**.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 39. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 39 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

E. Claims 40 and 57.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 40, the Examiner stated “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 39. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 28.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claims 1 and 39 also apply to his rejection of claim 40. (See Office Action, pp. 26-27.)

Applicants note that claim 40 includes limitations that are not recited in claims 1 and 39, and vice versa. In particular, claim 40 recites “displaying the page in a first browsing mode which makes less rich presentation on the screen than a second browsing mode in which definition information ... is applied,” which is not recited in claim 1 or 39. Similar to claim 1, however, claim 40 does recite a “browsing mode in which definition information is applied.” Also, similar to claim 39, claim 40 does recite switching onscreen representation from one mode to another, and that one mode of onscreen representation is less rich than another.

As stated above with respect to claim 1, Halahmi does not disclose displaying a page in a text browsing mode without using definition information, because it discloses constructed portions that include definition information. Also, as stated above with respect to claim 39, Halahmi’s disclosure of receiving constructed portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed, does not disclose switching onscreen representation from one mode that is less rich than another mode, in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not recite all the limitations of claim 40. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 40 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-16, 19, 33, 35-38, 41, and 55-61 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi (U.S. 2003/0011631). Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, 49, 59, 62-64, 66, 72, 75-77, and 79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Sai (U.S. 2004/0085331). Claims 10-12, 14, 50-52, 54, 67-69, 71, 80-82, and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Brosnahan (U.S. 7082577). Claims 13, 53, 70, and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi and Brosnahan in view of Chang (U.S. 2002/0010707).

A. Claim 19.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 19, the Examiner stated “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claim 1. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 28.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claim 1 (See Office Action, pg. 26-7) also apply to his rejection of claim 33.

Applicants note that amended independent claim 19 includes limitations that are not recited in claim 1, and vice versa. In particular, claim 19 recites “judging whether or not a predetermined time period has elapsed from a start of the obtaining operation.” Similar to claim 1, however, claim 19 recites “displaying the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode without using definition information” and “switching onscreen representation . . . from onscreen representation in the text browsing mode in which the definition information is not applied, to onscreen representation in which definition information is applied.”

As stated above, Halahmi discloses the display of **constructed portions** that include definition information. As such, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen representation, from a text browsing mode **without using definition information**, to an onscreen representation mode in which definition information is applied.

Thus, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose all the limitations of amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 19 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable.

B. Claim 33.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 33, the Examiner stated “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claim 1. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 28.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claim 1 also apply to his rejection of claim 33. (See Office Action, pp. 26-27.)

Applicants note that amended independent claim 33 includes limitations that are not recited in claim 1, and vice versa. In particular, claim 33 recites “switching on screen representation . . . from onscreen representation in the **first browsing mode** to onscreen representation in a **second browsing mode** in which definition information designated in a second markup language document of the page and applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by the document is applied.”

As stated above, Halahmi discloses the display of **constructed portions** that include definition information. As such, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen representation, from a first browsing mode, to a second browsing mode, or that one of the modes includes definition information designated in a second markup language document.

Thus, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not disclose all the limitations of amended independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 33 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

C. Claim 35.

In maintaining his rejection of claim 35, the Examiner stated “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 39. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pg. 28.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claims 1 and 39 also apply to his rejection of claim 35. (See Office Action, pp. 26-27.)

Applicants note that amended independent claim 35 includes limitations that are not recited in claims 1 and 39, and vice versa. In particular, claim 35 recites the limitations of “judging whether or not acquisition of the external style sheet and the external script is finished,” which is not recited in claims 1 or 39. Similar to claim 39, however, claim 35 does recite switching onscreen presentation from one mode to another and that one mode of onscreen presentation is less rich than another.

As stated above with respect to claim 39, the disclosure of receiving constructed portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed, does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from one mode that is less rich than another mode in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied.

Thus, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not recite all the limitations of amended independent claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 35 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

D. Claims 36-38, and 58.

In maintaining his rejection of claims 36-38 and 58, the Examiner stated “applicant appears to present the arguments substantially similar to those in claim 39. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.” (Office Action, pp. 28-29.) From the Examiner’s statement, Applicants believe the Examiner’s responses to claim 39 also apply to his rejection of claims 36-38 and 58. (See Office Action, pp. 27-28.)

Applicants note that amended independent claims 36-38 and 58 include limitations that are not recited in claim 39, and vice versa. Similar to claim 39, however, claims 36-38 and 58 do recite switching on screen representation from one browsing mode in which presentation on a screen is less rich than another browsing mode in which external style sheets and scripts are applied.

As stated above with respect to claim 39, the disclosing of receiving constructed portions in the background as a previous portion is being displayed, does not disclose switching onscreen

presentation from one mode that is less rich than another mode in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied.

Thus, Applicants submit that Halahmi does not recite all the limitations of amended independent claims 36-38 and 58. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 35-38 and 58 (and all claims depending therefrom) are allowable over Halahmi.

E. Claims 2, 5-7, 9-16, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 41-42, 45-47, 49-56, 58, 66-71, and 80-84.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Halahmi does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1, 18, 20, 32, 34, 39, 40 and 58, from which each of the above claims depends. Applicants respectfully submit that Sai, Brosnahan, and Chang fail to cure the deficiencies of Halahmi, nor are they alleged to.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 2, 5-7, 9-16, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 41-42, 45-47, 49-56, 58, 67-71, and 80-84 are allowable.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, 48, 60-61, 65, 73-74 and 78 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants submit that these claims depend from allowable independent claims for at least the reasons given above.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 448252001300. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6373